

When training needs cannot be satisfied internally, it is necessary to utilize outside sources, either Government or non-Government, and OTR has overall responsibility for the management and administration of the resultant external training program. OTR's function in this respect entails reviewing and processing requests for external training in accordance with Federal law, Agency regulations, budgetary considerations, and Agency needs. It screens requests; coordinates nominations and enrollments; handles security and cover requirements; prepares travel orders, tuition/travel advances, and reimbursements; and certifies billings and invoices for payment. It does not, however, maintain the Agency-wide training records and cost data (which are collected and compiled on the component level and scattered among at least 52 different offices or divisions) which are generated by implementation of the external training program. Not surprisingly, this results in rather imprecise fiscal recordkeeping and complicates the retrieval of such data.

The Investigative Staff recommends that CIA reevaluate the entire external training program, particularly the management and executive development areas wherein colleges and universities are relied upon heavily to provide career-enhancing courses. Many Agency executives contend that the measurement and evaluation of management and executive development programs, in the external training area also, are, at best, extremely difficult, if not impossible; nevertheless, in some instances, they question the payoff to the Agency for the amount of resources being invested.

One CIA official felt that external management and executive development courses are "too profit-oriented" and suggested that CIA conduct its own management training. Another official considered such outside courses to be "too business-oriented." A third Agency representative,

x

SECRET

in the a measure the benefits which might be forthcoming, "assumed" self-improvement or value to the Agency naturally follows from mere participation in external management training.

Until Agency-related value and benefits can be better demonstrated, hopefully through the already recommended in-depth analysis and continuous evaluation of supervisory and management training courses, it is the Investigative Staff's belief that participation in external management and executive development courses be substantially reduced.

One CIA official expressed mixed feelings concerning attendance at military-sponsored schools and war colleges. Such training can broaden one's total professional perspective and can lead to the development of useful work-related contacts; however, he is convinced that such course content is not in line with present Agency needs. It was his contention that greater use of the Federal Executive Institute, other Civil Service Commission offerings, and other Department of Defense training courses would prove more beneficial and certainly more economical. REF-1 ✓

The Investigative Staff also recommends that OTR be charged with the responsibility of maintaining all external training records, including the related cost data, to insure that one uniform and responsive fiscal system prevails throughout the Agency and that all training-related data has a central locus.

OTR's responsibility for developing, coordinating, and conducting instructional programs for Agency personnel, and for arranging and monitoring employee participation in non-Agency training programs, is shared, at least in part, by all of the Agency's more than 50 components. Components staff, teach, or arrange for formal training of their own personnel when such training can be done more economically and effectively, and OTR's identification with component training is in its assigned responsibility to review and support all Agency training activities.

Such a relationship is established and carried out through a network of close to 60 training officers--5 senior training officers representing the directorates and 1 training officer per component within the Agency. Few of these perform as full-time training officers, and the network, therefore, is a loosely knit one and cannot provide the kind of responsible supervision required to plan, monitor, and evaluate a multi-million dollar training program.

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/11/08 : CIA-RDP81-00896R000100170001-9

attributed to student salaries. Only upon specific request of the Investigative Staff were such indirect costs forthcoming.

It is to be noted that, unless otherwise indicated, the external training cost figures mentioned immediately herein-after do not include student salaries.

In reviewing the Agency's external training program, several items were identified by the Investigative Staff which are worthy of mention.

Full-time academic training is provided at colleges and universities throughout the United States and, occasionally, in foreign institutions. The selection of an external training facility should be based on its ability to meet a training need effectively, economically, and in a timely manner. Other factors to be considered are comparative costs, geographic accessibility, and curriculum content.

The Investigative Staff found instances of external training which are subject to question.

Sixteen individuals studied business administration at 8 different educational institutions; 14 of those employees attended schools in the Metropolitan Washington area and 2 attended schools in Pennsylvania. Related course costs varied at the undergraduate level from a low of \$499 to a high of \$1,916.

Seven students studied international management, international affairs, and international studies at the graduate and undergraduate levels at four different institutions. Associated costs varied from \$563 at the George Washington University to \$8,175 at Harvard University and \$8,895 at the American Graduate School for International Management in Arizona. Those courses offered outside the Metropolitan Washington area, of course, also entail added costs for transportation and per diem. Whatever the justification may be for selecting a distant training site, as indicated above, it certainly increases the overall cost of the related training.

As part of the Training Selection Board program, 10 employees attended executive management development courses at the following schools during FY 1976:

School	Course	Cost	Unit	Unit
University of Pittsburgh-----	8 weeks	\$4,500	\$3,066	\$1,314
Pennsylvania State University-----	4 weeks	2,250	3,941	1,689
Harvard University-----	14 weeks	6,000	3,000	1,286
Cornell University-----	5 weeks	3,600	5,040	2,160

The data incorporated in the above schedule was obtained from the 1976 edition of "Bricker's Directory of University Sponsored Executive Development Programs." The prices quoted above are for single occupancy and include tuition and meals; any related travel and per diem expenses would be additions to the above costs. It was learned from OTR officials that nine Agency employees are scheduled to attend similar courses during FY 1977.

A review of the 1977 program descriptions made available by OTR indicates that the content of the aforementioned executive management development courses is structured for the business executive and heavily oriented toward the management of a private enterprise. In contrast, the U.S. Civil Service Commission offers executive management development courses geared to Government needs which are more economical. These are offered at the Federal Executive Institute (FEI), Charlottesville, Virginia. As offered by FEI, the "Senior Executive Education Program," 7 weeks in length, costs \$3,000, and the 3-week "Executive Leadership and Management Program" has a tuition fee of \$1,300. Tuition for both FEI courses is less than the 3-week (Harvard University excepted) and 7-week unit costs cited earlier relative to the Training Selection Board program. During FY 1976, CIA sent four employees to each of the FEI courses mentioned above at an estimated total cost of \$20,692. GS-16

The Agency participates in another Civil Service Commission program entitled "Education for Public Management." This 9-month program is offered at nine participating universities (Cornell, Harvard, Indiana, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton, Southern California, Virginia, Stanford, and Washington). This interagency long-term training program coordinated by the Civil Service Commission is not a degree program. It is considered as an opportunity to use university resources flexibly to promote career development. Each of the participating universities, excepting Harvard, provides a core seminar for "Education for Public Management" participants which brings them together to focus on common issues.

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/11/08 : CIA-RDP81-00896R000100170001-9

in public affairs and administration. However, it is apparent from a review of the 1976 "Education for Public Management" catalog that actual implementation of this program varies considerably from one university to another.

Cornell University, for example, encourages participants to select courses from fields of study different from their own academic backgrounds or job responsibilities, and suggests involvement in such areas as agriculture, city planning, computer science, law, psychology, and sociology, to name but a few. The Indiana University program is multidisciplinary in nature with concentrations in such areas of public administration and public affairs as financial management and budget administration, international development administration, and technology forecasting and assessment. Princeton University's courses are designed around a central core of that institution's offerings oriented specifically toward public policy.

CIA's participation in the "Education for Public Management" program during FY 1976 is set forth in the following table:

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Tuition</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Cornell University-----	\$6,100	2	\$22,110
Indiana University-----	5,000	1	9,630
Stanford University-----	6,200	1	12,200
University of Virginia-----	4,000	1	8,690
University of Washington----	3,500	1	9,390

The total cost of this program during FY 1976, \$62,020, includes travel and per diem charges (but does not include the salaries of participants), and represents a substantial investment of Agency funds. In addition, while an employee is receiving such on-duty, full-time training, his services are not available to the Agency as a productive resource for an extended period of time.

In addition, CIA sends personnel to various military-sponsored schools and war colleges, including the Royal College of Defence Studies, London, England. No tuition charges are levied at such institutions, of course; however, the travel and per diem expenses for Agency participants at such schools in the United States during FY 1976 ranged from \$800 to \$5,732 per student, and \$8,040 per student at the United Kingdom school. Fifteen employees participated in this program during FY 1976 at a cost of \$45,138, or an average cost of \$3,009 per student.

Approved For Release 2001/11/08 : CIA-RDP81-00896R000100170001-9

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/11/08 : CIA-RDP81-00896R000100170001-9

Fifteen CIA representatives attended conferences and training sessions during FY 1976 at the Brookings Institution at a cost of \$14,800. Twenty-two persons attended various short courses (1 to 2 weeks) at the Civil Service Commission's Executive Seminar Centers at a cost of \$23,350 during FY 1976, or an average cost of \$1,061 per student.

Critique of External Training

The Investigative Staff recommends that CIA reevaluate the entire external training program, particularly the management and executive development areas wherein colleges and universities are relied upon heavily to provide career-enhancing courses. Many Agency executives contend that the measurement and evaluation of management and executive development programs are, at best, extremely difficult, if not impossible; nevertheless, in some instances, they question the payoff to the Agency for the amount of resources being invested.

One CIA official felt that such outside training courses were "too profit-oriented" and suggested that CIA conduct its own management training. Another official considered these courses to be "too business-oriented." A third Agency representative admitted that there is no adequate or accurate yardstick available to measure the improvement of an individual or benefit to the Agency which accrues as a result of such external training; nevertheless, he "assumed" self-improvement or value to the Agency naturally follows from mere participation in such training.

Until Agency-related value and benefits can be better demonstrated, it is the Investigative Staff's belief that participation in external management and executive development courses be reduced.

One CIA official expressed mixed feelings concerning attendance at military-sponsored schools and war colleges. Such training can broaden one's total professional perspective and can lead to the development of useful work-related contacts; however, he is convinced that such course content is not in line with present Agency needs. It was his contention that perhaps greater use of the Federal Executive Institute, other Civil Service Commission offerings, and other Department of Defense training courses would prove more beneficial and certainly more economical. GRADE

The Investigative Staff also recommends that OTR be charged with the responsibility of maintaining all external training records, including the related cost data, in order to insure

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/11/08 : CIA-RDP81-00896R000100170001-9

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/11/08 : CIA-RDP81-00896R000100170001-9

that one uniform and responsive fiscal system prevails throughout the Agency and all related data has a central locus.

D. Critique of Overall Training Program

While OTR is responsible for developing, coordinating, and conducting instructional programs for Agency personnel, it is also responsible for arranging and monitoring employee participation in non-Agency training programs. This responsibility is shared, in part, by all of the Agency's more than 50 components. Components staff, teach, or arrange for formal training of their own personnel when such training can be done more economically and effectively. OTR's identification with component training is in its assigned responsibility to review and support all Agency training activities.

Such a relationship is established and carried out through a network of close to 60 training officers--5 senior training officers representing the Office of the Director of Central Intelligence and the 4 directorates, and 1 training officer representing each component within the Agency. Few of these perform as full-time training officers, even on the directorate level, and the network, therefore, is a loosely knit one and cannot provide the kind of responsible supervision required to plan, monitor, and evaluate a multimillion dollar training program.

The five senior training officers, for example, spend varying amounts of time on training matters. The senior training officer in the Directorate of Operations is a full-time position. The remaining four so-called senior training officers, however, spend only from 5 to 20 percent of their time in fulfilling their training responsibilities. Since September 1976, the senior training officers have been meeting monthly with OTR--one senior training officer smilingly noted the coincidence of the initiation of such meetings with the Investigative Staff's assigned interest in the Agency's overall training program.

It was learned that, except in the Directorate of Operations, no formal relationship exists between the senior training officers and the component training officers. The Directorate of Operations, by virtue of its activities, is in daily contact with its own components. The Directorate of Science and Technology uses a monthly newsletter as a formal communications channel. No training committees have been established within the directorates other than ad hoc committees. Senior training officers submit virtually no training reports, have no responsibilities at the directorate level to

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/11/08 : CIA-RDP81-00896R000100170001-9

determine. ~~Approved For Release 2001/11/08 : CIA-RDP81-00896R000100170001-9~~ ally, are not involved in establishing training needs. Again, the senior training officer in the Directorate of Operations is an exception; he does have exclusive and clearly defined training duties and responsibilities. Most training responsibilities, therefore, are left to the component training officers, some of whom are full-time (Logistics, Security, and Communications), while others are, in fact, administrative officers devoting 10 to 20 percent of their time to training matters.

Several OTR officials have commented that student selection for training courses, in some instances, is questionable and should receive closer attention from component training officers.

In view of the magnitude of resources being invested in Agency training, it would appear that tighter coordination and control of the overall training program could be effected. Stronger lines of communication should be established between the various segments of the Agency; such efforts would help to assure the establishment of training priorities which are timely, necessary, and economical, and also establish a higher degree of accountability.

One official noted that the Agency never had to account in depth for its overall training program and had no requirement to formally evaluate it. From gratuitous comments offered by other Agency officials, it also appears that the study conducted by the Investigative Staff for the Committee sparked an introspective look at CIA training by Agency personnel not previously undertaken. Such analysis and evaluation should be continuous and penetrative.